

The COMMONWEAL

VOLUME XXXI

January 12, 1940

NUMBER 12

CONTENTS

THE WEEK	253
CATHOLICS IN FINLAND	
<i>Right Reverend L. G. Ligutti</i>	256
WPA WORKER STRIKES BACK	
<i>Leonard A. Allen</i>	258
"HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT"	
<i>M. Whitcomb Hess</i>	259
A LABOR SCHOOL TAKES INVENTORY	
<i>Vincent J. McLaughlin</i>	261
VIEWS AND REVIEWS	
<i>Michael Williams</i>	262
COMMUNICATIONS	263
THE STAGE	
<i>Grenville Vernon</i>	266
THE SCREEN	
<i>Philip T. Hartung</i>	266
IN THE GROOVE	
<i>C. F. Balliett, Jr.</i>	268
BOOKS OF THE WEEK	269

Forces in American Criticism—J. Pierpont Morgan—The Renaissance and English Humanism—Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights—Clothed with the Sun—The Dark Wheel—The Flowering of Mysticism—The Church and the Social Problem of Our Day—The Spirit of Gregorian Chant

THE INNER FORUM	272
-----------------	-----

THE COMMONWEAL is indexed in the *Reader's Guide*, *Catholic Periodical Index* and *Catholic Bookman*.

Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc., 386 Fourth Avenue, New York.
Annual Subscriptions: U. S. and Canada, \$5.00; Foreign, \$6.00.

Editors: PHILIP BURNHAM, EDWARD SKILLIN, JR.; HARRY LORIN
BINSE, Managing Editor; MICHAEL WILLIAMS, Special Editor;
JAMES F. FALLON, Advertising Manager.

The Text and the Interpretation

THE POLITICAL commentaries on the Pope's Christmas message to the College of Cardinals seemed to be mostly efforts to discover whether the Vatican is on the side of Germany or of the Allies. The Pope's Five Points of *Christian Century*, and even Walter Lippmann, identified the peace program of His Holiness more closely with the hinted objectives of France and Britain than the text seems to warrant. This especially appears the case in assuming that the Pope believes the war will be and should be carried out until Germany is beaten past any opposition to demands made upon her. But it is inescapably true that the Pope's words fit next to infinitely closer to those of Chamberlain than they do to the New Year's Hitler message of unitary European "socialism"; and the Pope did not indeed say that the occasion for building peace "with the necessary guarantees and security" is here.

The Pope's message should be studied closely, and "each at his post" must try to "keep both mind and heart open" and not presume to dictate dogmatically the practical interpretation of the five fundamental points of a just and honorable

peace which His Holiness listed. We hope speculation and application will work along at least these half a dozen directions: How separately must the nations be considered, particularly how similar should the Western attitude toward Germany and Russia be? The Pope declares that "to preserve the Church and her mission among men from every contact with such anti-Christian spirit is our duty. . . ." ("Such spirit" involves "atrocities and illegal use of means of destruction . . . disregard of human dignity, liberty and life . . . anti-Christian and even atheistic propaganda.") How great a wall and what kind of a wall should we try to erect?

The Pope clearly indicates that the peace settlement ought not be made as usual solely by the beligerents, but that every nation has a right and duty to participate. How can we try to implement this? The Pope speaks with anguish of the "pernicious anemia . . . the exhausted or weakened economy" which will follow the war. What duties and rights have neutrals to compensate for this disaster and offer "means for economic and social reconstruction"? The third point of the plan deals with "international institutions." In what manner should this point be linked with the first, "the right to life and independence of all nations"? The Pope envisages international "juridical institutions which would serve to guarantee the loyal and faithful carrying out of terms . . . revising and correcting. . . ." What sanctions must these juridical institutions command? Finally, it is useful to notice the emphasis given in the message to "confusion" and "distrust" without which this war could have been prevented. To secure real peace, the fifth point speaks of "that spirit, namely, of intimate, acute responsibility that measures and weighs human statutes according to the holy, unshakable rules of Divine Law."

Many Signs of General Religious Revival

THE FEELINGS of personal insecurity and of humanitarian concern for the fate of other peoples probably explain much of the renewed interest in religion and religious solutions that is one of the signs of the times. *Religious News Service* cites some very sketchy statistics to show that in the past two or three years the proportion of people that believe religion is waning has dropped from 1/2 to 1/3, while opinion that religion is on the rise has gone from 1/4 to 1/3. President Seymour of Yale officially reports renewed interest in religion on his college campus. Dorothy Thompson predicts for 1940, "Throughout the Western World there will be a deepened interest in religion and much speculation on the idea of a Christian society" and forecasts the publication of many Catholic and Protestant books highly critical of capitalism.

Marxism, totalitarianism. The January issue of *Fortune*, big business organ which often ventures into political and social questions, features an extraordinary editorial on America's religious background, its need of authoritative religious guidance and belief, which is warmly welcomed in certain Protestant circles. But why multiply examples? The end-result of philosophic liberalism is all too plain to many intelligent observers. And the peoples of the world are painfully seeking a tenable ideal. It is well to remember, as Christopher Dawson observes in "The Making of Europe," that "the foundations of Europe were laid in fear and weakness and suffering." It is the general run of Christians themselves, especially Catholics, by their outlook and their actions, who will largely decide whether or not once again the new age that succeeds a period of darkness will be an era of religious faith, hope and comparative well-being.

Labor Enters 1940

THE LABOR YEAR opens with the Wagner Act and the Labor Board under heavy bombardment. While the House Committee and great press are belaboring it, however, the system is being developed, shaken down and clarified. Three unanimous decisions of the Supreme Court give the Board a clearer status and protect it from some harassment while it is arriving at its final decisions. A lower federal court assures the safety of a "company" union, provided it can prove it is genuinely independent of the management and freely desired by the labor force. With all the charges of how bad the Labor Board is, it is interesting to note that the Supreme Court takes a very different view. Out of 22 decisions on Board matters so far handed down by the Supreme Court, the NLRB has won outright 18 times, won partially 2 times and suffered only 2 defeats.

But labor relations must improve tremendously before "industrial peace" can be expected. That is the burden of the paper read by Monsignor Haas of Catholic University before the American Association for Labor Relations at their annual meeting in Philadelphia. Unable to print the whole thing, we will cull a few passages for emphasis:

The goals in any socially worthwhile program may be set down as full production of goods, proper distribution of goods, wage and price balances, protection of personal liberty while achieving these ends and protection against unwarranted speed, against arbitrary and unjustifiable dismissal, and against disregard by management of workers' grievances. . . .

The principal means toward the ends are: first, conferences between the representatives of management, of labor, and of agriculture, with the govern-

ment sitting with them; second, extension of collective bargaining; and finally, mediation. . . .

The program here suggested differs . . . in that the enforcement of things agreed upon would be shifted largely if not entirely from the government to the parties themselves. . . .

The greatest scandal of the NLRB is that it is necessary to have such an agency to protect the elementary right of self-organization. . . .

It would be unfortunate for Congress to proceed as if mediation were a cure-all, and invest the US Conciliation Service with legal sanctions, especially compulsory powers to enter labor controversies. . . .

The outstanding problem of the nation is unemployment, and unemployment is inextricably tied up with industrial conflict.

January 26 Gets Nearer

AS THIS is written, no definite shape has emerged for trade relations between the US and Japan after our present treaty (signed in 1911) lapses on January 26. The State Department will find itself definitely in the better bargaining position: war in Europe has materially reduced Japan's trading with that continent; a Russo-Japanese pact would be rather nebulous, since geography deprives it of anything much more than local significance (in the perennial fisheries and border disputes); and Japan must be able to keep up her foreign trade or else face economic crisis. Her Achilles's heel is much the same as England's—a concentrated island population at home depending for its prosperity on foreign commerce and feeling the necessity for territorial possessions on the mainland. Yet Japan also can bargain. By declaring war on China she can force us to refuse aid to China except under the terms of our neutrality law, which would mean in practice cutting off all help; she can threaten to destroy all our activities in China—at least in the "occupied" portions of China; she can use the threat of a Soviet alliance for all it is worth. What will emerge from the bargaining it is impossible to predict, and "well-informed" sources say that the State Department is making no more guesses than the general public. But the outcome will be of first-rate importance for the peace and future of the world, for if the new treaty is ill-conceived it may contain the germs of a conflict of even greater magnitude than that which now so sadly preoccupies the world, and it would be a conflict in which we could not be neutral. The obvious desideratum is a prosperous Far East, with China and Japan at peace and able to deal with other nations on a civilized and just basis, a basis which is not that of a return to the old European-American domination of China's economic life, either. The problems has more spines than a horsechestnut burr; good luck and patience to those who must grasp it.

A New Type of TVA Yardstick

THE ANNUAL report of the Tennessee Valley Authority brought the usual charges that methods of computation were too misleading to serve as a national yardstick. This year's report claims that TVA is at last, after six years, on a paying basis; it cites an impressive series of gains in rural electrification, flood control and soil conservation. Receiving much attention in *Business Week* is the degree of efficiency attained in TVA office work. It is rather intriguing to learn, for instance, that an office-worker on a 7-hour day attains his peak of efficiency at 9:30 A.M. and again at 2 P.M. Or that the best way to stimulate the quantity and quality of office output is to decree a rest period of 10 minutes at 10 A.M. and 15 minutes at 3 P.M. It sounds slightly musical comedy, but considerable economies were made by comparing the lives of a piece of carbon paper to the nine lives of a cat and by posting an ill-starred paper towel, not used for the purpose for which it was intended, with a plea for cooperation in cutting down the TVA annual consumption of 2,500,000 paper towels. Most fascinating of all were the accomplishments attained by concentrating files, materials, etc., within the radius of a stenographer's arm flexed at the elbow. To think that by TVA methods a typist can eliminate 35,000 motions a day and increase her output 803 percent. What is to become of the legend of government inefficiency?

The Attempt to Save Cambridge

OF THE TWO currently celebrated efforts at censorship, the less comic, made by Mr. James C. Petrillo, musicians' leader in Chicago, can be passed over in this paragraph, with the mere addendum that "less comic" in the sentence above does not mean "more acceptable," but "more serious." Mr. Petrillo knew exactly what he meant when he ordered the name of the CIO president deleted from the Chicago stage—he meant despotism with a very practical and self-interested purpose, even though he apparently failed this time to get away with it. Whereas it seems honestly open to question whether the Cambridge City Council knew what it meant when it tried (unanimously) to get the words "Lenin" and "Leningrad" made illegal in that municipality. Anyway, it cannot have meant what it said. This was apparently admitted by Councilman Michael J. Sullivan, chief mover in the business, when he admitted under inquiry that the measure was not intended to be retroactive. That is, policemen were not to go through the libraries of Harvard and Radcliffe, the newspaper

files and private homes of the community, searching for the forbidden words and confiscating all the paper that bore them.

So far, so good. But even starting from scratch, it is possible that the measure would have encountered enforcement difficulties if it had not been done to death by the mayor's pocket veto. That official, paying tribute to the lofty motives that inspired this implementing of the Council's drive on communism, concluded very properly with the words: "But after all, we still have the Bill of Rights." We also have other things, like roofs, locked doors and pencils; if a separate policeman had been assigned to every home in Cambridge, someone might still escape into an attic or a cellar and write the dreadful words "Lenin" and "Leningrad" over and over again, to the corruption of morals and the utter ruin of the Republic, and the City Council could do nothing about it. It is, we know, a mistake to become excited at the spectacle of folly, which sooner or later defeats itself—in this case, happily, sooner. But what is to be thought of a group of adults, the advisers and in a sense guardians of a great American city, who are willing to affix their names to a folly like this?

Tracing the King's Quotation

IT IS PLEASANT to record that another minor crisis in Great Britain has been passed successfully. That is the crisis precipitated by King George's Christmas broadcast, in which he used a quotation that no one throughout the reaches of that Empire the sun never sets on could place. If President Roosevelt had done such a thing, the press conference would have cleared it up the following day. But whether it is *lèse majesté*, or just not cricket, to ask a king directly, they in any event do these things differently in Britain. Aside from the literally innumerable private searchers, the records show that the manuscripts of the British Museum were checked up; that the Parliamentary Library in Ottawa was fincombed, and that that accomplished literatus Lord Tweedsmuir acknowledged himself baffled; most surprisingly of all, that John Masfield looked through Chesterton's works and also confessed failure. We thought better of Masfield; the quotation (which we do not like well enough to requote here), though acceptably correct and even religious in content, is couched in the pseudo-Scriptural style which we can only imagine Chesterton dismissing as proper to a lady theosophist. It proves, in the event, to have been at least the style of a lady—a Miss Haskins, who wrote it as an introduction to her privately circulated poems many years ago. So the British Broadcasting Corporation now states, and Britain breathes again.

Literary
Crisis

All-Time
Zero

Catholics in Finland

Most Finns are Lutherans, but like every Christian country, Finland has a Catholic history.

By the Right Reverend L. G. Ligutti

THIS LAST CHRISTMAS the newspapers published accounts of the contribution made by the Holy Father for the assistance and relief of Finnish Catholics. The news must have come somewhat as a surprise to most of those who read it, for the overwhelming majority of Finns are Lutherans and most people do not know that there are any Catholics in Finland, or that Finland, like all the Scandinavian countries, was at one time Catholic. The vivid light cast upon this sturdy little republic by the heroic events transpiring there affords opportunity to recapitulate briefly the history of the Church in Finland.

The original conversion of Finland to Catholicism came mainly as a result of the Swedish crusades. The *Suomalaiset* (inhabitants of Suomi) came under the new domination during the First Crusade, probably about 1155, which was commanded by King Erik of Sweden who had in his retinue Bishop Henrik, born in England and martyred in 1158. The *Hämäläiset* (inhabitants of Häme) were conquered in the Second Crusade in 1240; and the *Karjalaiset* (inhabitants of Karjala) in the Third Crusade in 1293.

The principal ecclesiastical persons in Finland while the country remained Catholic were the Bishops of Turku, who from the end of the fourteenth century were all educated at European universities and were principally men of Finnish noble birth. Perhaps the foremost among them was Bishop Maunu Tavast (1412-1450). Under the patronage of the Church, culture flourished, with Turku as a natural center. Students from Finland were particularly numerous in Paris, and three Finns served as rectors of its university.

Finland's Catholic period really came to an end under the reign of Gustavus Vasa of Sweden (1523-1560), although King Sigismund (1592-1599) was a Catholic. Under Gustavus, Pietari Särkilahti, a Canon in Turku from 1524 to 1528, and previous to that a student of Wittenberg, preached Protestantism in Turku. But the real propagator of Protestantism in Finland was Bishop Mikael Agricola (1557). The first Protestant bishop of Turku was Martti Skytte, a Dominican, who had been solemnly installed with full Catholic ceremony at Strengnäs on January 5, 1528, but whose appointment had not been confirmed by the Holy See.

The Council of Upsala (1593) adopted the Augsburg Confession, which resulted in "the creation of a Protestant State Church and a period of religious intolerance and strict dogmatism" in the united kingdom of Sweden and Finland. This was the beginning of Catholicism's long winter.

Breaths of spring

The first breath of spring came in 1779, in 1781, and in the Edict of Toleration in 1783, when Gustavus III of Sweden (1772-1792) granted Catholics of foreign nationality the right "to the free and open exercise of their religion." Meanwhile, part of Finland had been incorporated into the Russian Empire in 1721, but the whole of it was not so incorporated until 1809, and thus Gustavus's acts affected part of what is now Finland.

On the initiative of the Russian Government in 1799, a Catholic parish was established in Viipuri (Viborg) for the benefit of Catholic soldiers and their families. Under similar circumstances the parish of St. Henrik was established in 1857 in Helsinki. During the century of Russian domination, the Church in Finland was subject to the Catholic Metropolitan of Russia, the Archbishop of Mohilew; but in various matters the Church came under the operation of Finnish administrative legislation. Various laws were promulgated in the 70's and 80's relating to the freedom of religion and the penalties for proselytizing. The Constitution of 1903, drawn up by the Social Democrats, marked a new step in religious freedom by stating that "religion is a private affair."

In 1896 the military treasury of Russia ceased making any provision for the church and clergy of Helsinki, and Catholics were forced to seek a new financial and legal status.

In the meantime, the first two native-born, post-reformation priests were put in charge of Finnish parishes: Father Wilried Von Christierson at Helsinki, and Monsignor G. A. Carling at Viipuri.

After the war was over, Monsignor Carling addressed a long letter, dated December 20, 1919, to the Finnish Senate, explaining clearly and eloquently the position and needs of the Church in Finland. There followed long negotiations, both in Rome and through Monsignor Ratti, who was then in Warsaw. At last the Holy See decided to confide the cure of souls in Finland to the Fathers

of the Sacred Heart of the Company of Mary, and to elevate Finnish territory to the status of a Vicariate Apostolic with the episcopal dignity (June 8, 1920). Monsignor John Mickael Buckx of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart of the Company of Mary was named as the first Vicar Apostolic by Benedict XV; he was consecrated on August 15, 1923.

Despite the cordial good feeling of the Holy See and the friendly attitude of the government toward the Church, both clergy and laity, it was not until November 14, 1939, that the Vicariate Apostolic was inscribed in the national registry of religious communities. The proposed concordat of 1922 had never been ratified, and therefore had never had the force of law. The resolutions of the Council of Ministers, dated November 14, 1939, consisted of a preamble and thirteen paragraphs, and gave the Church legal status, regulating its relationship to the national economy. Here are a few of the more important provisions embodied in these resolutions:

The belief of the Community is that which the Catholic Church believes in the whole world, a belief established upon Holy Writ and upon the doctrines of the General Councils and the Fathers of the Church. The Community celebrates its Divine Services and all other religious acts in conformity with Catholic Rites and Ritual, it distributes the Holy Sacraments as required by the liturgical books approved by the Catholic Church.

Admission and exclusion of members is to be in accordance with the Codex Juris Canonici, the laws on the liberty of religion and the additional decrees and dispositions of the government.

The goods of the parish are administered under the direction of the Vicar Apostolic by the Pastor in accordance with the laws of the Catholic Church and the legislation in force in the Republic.

Of course, in addition to the specific rights enjoyed by the Catholic Church by virtue of the resolutions of the Council of Ministers, she likewise enjoys the rights and privileges common to all religious communities—such as the right to acquire property sufficient for church, rectory, school, cemetery, and charitable institutions.

In Sweden even the Vicar Apostolic is registered on the books of "his" Lutheran parish; in Finland, Catholic pastors keep the official registry books for their parishioners. A prospective convert to the Church must notify his Lutheran or Orthodox pastor of his intentions. A child is brought up in the church of his father unless there is an agreement in writing signed previous to the marriage that the child shall belong to the church of its mother. Catholic children are not required to be present for religious instruction given in the public schools. Catholics are exempt from the payment of tithes for the support of Lutheran or

Orthodox churches. If the bride in a mixed marriage is a Catholic, a priest performs the marriage; if she is a non-Catholic, the marriage is performed by her Lutheran or Orthodox pastor. I myself can testify, as a result of my experiences in Finland last summer while visiting and studying the Finnish cooperatives and agricultural schools, that a spirit of toleration and goodwill is prevalent throughout the country.

The present state of affairs

Here are a few facts and statistics concerning the present state of the Church in Finland. The present Vicar Apostolic is the Most Reverend William Cobben of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart of the Company of Mary. He was installed in May, 1934. His Vicariate, which includes the whole of Finland, has twelve priests in all, two of them converts, four of them natives, and four of them seculars. There are four parishes in the Vicariate: St. Henrik, Helsinki, St. Hyacinthe, Viipuri; Sacred Heart of Jesus, Turku; and St. Bridget, Terijoki. Mass is celebrated once a month at Kuopio and Hamina, and a few times a year at Tampere. Helsinki parish includes the whole of Northern Finland. In 1938 its register listed 1,759 Catholics, 20,679 communions, 600 paschal communions. There were 11 mixed marriages and one Catholic marriage. Each year there are approximately 50 converts—mainly intellectuals and teachers.

Modern Finland contains one Catholic school with 80 children and a summer camp for the children of the poor. During my visit I met 9 sisters at Helsinki and 5 at Viipuri; 4 Precious Blood Sisters from O'Fallon, Missouri, had recently arrived to open a mission in Helsinki. They left Finland before hostilities began.

A Catholic monthly is published in the Finnish language, *Uskon Sanoma* (The Messenger of the Faith), and at Christmastime a Swedish yearly booklet, "Vox Romana," is widely circulated. *Credo*, a Catholic Scandinavian literary magazine, has as its Finnish editor Jarl Gallen of Helsinki. The majority of Finnish Catholics are of Swedish ancestry, a few are Poles, and, in central Finland, there are a few Germans and Austrians. In Helsinki an Italian sermon is preached at one Sunday Mass for the small Italian colony.

The fine democratic spirit which pervades the Finnish government, Finnish institutions, education, and even business; the open-minded attitude of its leaders; the balanced judgment of its population; the honesty and sincerity of their behavior—all inspire the warm admiration of even an occasional visitor. American Catholics should be concerned with the loss which the Church may suffer by Russian victory. Yet, confident of eventual victory, we should do what we can to aid Catholics in a land of real political democracy.

WPA Worker Strikes Back

How a man on the receiving end of WPA feels about criticisms thereof—a human document.

By Leonard A. Allen

MAGAZINES, newspapers and radio programs are filled with accounts of what critics think of WPA workers. It is about time to let a WPA worker give his side of the story. Although my pen is not so handy to lean upon as a shovel, I shall, nevertheless, strive for the right atmosphere in which to lean forward in a critical position and bluntly ask, "Do you want to swap places with me?"

If you are *enjoying* the questionable benefits of the dole, then you will hastily reply, "For Pete's sake, yes!" But for God's sake and your own I hope you are not in this group which is just one degree above desperation. And, my friends, it is the initiatory degree that marks the first step, compulsory to all who must choose between the WPA and starving to death.

Undoubtably, you have heard or read many so-called WPA jokes. In spite of these, believe me, being on the WPA is no joke. Assuming that these puns are funny in the first place, they may be said to represent the acme in sadistic humor. Our children will tell the next generation how funny it all was. Do you yearn to bring up *your* children on a WPA *subsistence* wage?

Our *friends* in Congress late last spring passed a law designed to help us. I do not know where they got the design, possibly from the dictators who set out to *help* their neighbors and end up by helping themselves. Representative Woodrum, Democrat from Virginia, triumphantly announced, "We have given the WPA a chance to clean its own house."

We do not question Representative Woodrum's sincerity—not much, anyway. Nevertheless, he has not offered any chance for house cleaning. Instead he has apparently given the administrative department of the WPA the not unwelcome opportunity to persecute the rank and file. The administrators seem to somewhat relish their position. I understand that Colonel Harrington is in favor of the monthly subsistence wage scale and does not feel unkindly toward the thirty day starvation provision. Indeed, it is difficult for the average relief worker to look upon Colonel Harrington and say, "My friend." Our *fuehrer* treats us more like buck-privates than employees. If you don't know what that means—Join the Army and See the World!

You have been told that the WPA is a veritable hornets' nest of communism. Lo and behold, how high some of our critics hold the ideal of tolerance in one hand and at the same time carry the torch of Machiavelli in the other! Today, the term communist lends itself to convenient and often amusing flexibility. More accurately speaking, however, a communist is one who allegedly advocates the overthrow of our present government by force and the substitution of one in which everything is owned in common, with the possible exception of the family toothbrush. There is about as much communism among WPA workers as there is alcohol in near beer. It's one of those cases of Oh so *near* and yet so far away.

Now comes the all important question which is so often put to us—Why don't you get a job in private industry? I shall give our esteemed critics the answers they want on this one. We are on the WPA because we want to be. Understand? We wouldn't accept a good job if it was offered. We enjoy the humiliation of the dole which precedes work relief. We are prospering on \$40 and \$50 a month while you tell the public that we are getting \$10 and \$15 a day. Jobs are so plentiful we are finding it increasingly difficult to dodge them. But we will persevere! With our picks and our shovels we have our *career* to look after. You see, we are career men. And when the kiddo comes along and says, "Daddy, why can't I have some ice cream like the little boy next door does"—Well, we don't mind that either. We like it. Now have I answered your question?

Leaning on shovels

With the beginning of the WPA millions of men were allotted a pick, a shovel and a number. If you worked twice as hard as the man beside you there was no chance to earn one single cent more. This condition is still true today. In spite of this set-back, the workers became more and more efficient as they were more and more encouraged by threats of dismissal.

Everyone will agree, I believe, that no man should get a good day's pay unless he does a good day's work, regardless of whether it's for the government or for, let us say, a local contractor. However can you imagine your local contractor say, "Boys, in reward for your endeavor I am

giving you twice as many hours, less money and a month's vacation without pay?"

July 11 Major General J. G. Harbord, chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, told the Institute of Public Affairs that relief clients should surrender their right to vote. A relief client voting, he said, is in the position of a "judge sitting in an action in which he has a financial interest."

Why restrict your theory to relief clients, General? What about the farmers who receive millions for not planting anything? Or the miners whose employment is due to the fact that the government has artificially raised the price of gold and silver? These people have to pay the butcher, the baker, etc., all of which subsidizes, directly or indirectly, nearly every citizen in the nation. Disfranchise any one section of the American people and you have gone a long way on the road toward civil war. And where is the voter that doesn't vote for his own financial interest?

Politicians are human. They sometimes must cater to their pet hates even though innocent families have to suffer. Conservative Tweedledums were out to get even with Liberal Tweedledees, and though God says, "Vengeance is Mine," certain participants thought otherwise. The Gallup Poll recently revealed that 89 percent of *all* the voters favored work relief in preference to the dole. You Tweedles think that over.

The next time your Representative or Senator rises in Congress to deplore the plight of the Jews in Germany, make an appeal to his sense of justice. Tell him that Germany has its Jews, India its Untouchables, and the United States its Unemployed.

God Bless America—It's the title of a popular song and expresses a sentiment worthy of very serious consideration. Be assured God will never forget America or the American people. In 1940 we have an opportunity to elect a Congress that will not forget the American people either.

"His Majesty's Government"

A criticism of England as defender of the democratic faith.*

By M. Whitcomb Hess

ON JULY 4, 1776, the thirteen United States of America unanimously refused to accept England any longer as their political mother. They gave as their reasons certain details of what was described as "a long train of abuses and usurpations"; but what actually motivated the separation of these sons of Albion from the old country was nicely formulated in a single sentence (the "verbal statement" that underwrites America's claim to democracy):

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among them are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

That these things are not yet self-evident in the "royal throne of kings" has been for years a matter of grave concern to the group in England called His Majesty's Opposition. A Presbyterian exchange-minister to England this summer questioned that country's right to be classed among the democracies in the first sermon he preached in his Ohio parish on his return in September. This preacher who has been a frequent visitor in European countries mentioned the shock he (along

with every sensitive traveler) has felt for years, and had experienced again in 1939, at the cruel poverty side by side with the maharajah splendor of Britain's ruling classes. For "MISERY—squalid, agonizing, ruffianly—stares one in the face in every street of London" no less today than in past years. (These particular descriptives were written by Margaret Fuller when she went to England in 1846.) The man Jane Addams's horror-stricken young eyes saw devouring a rotten cabbage is a case in point.

"We have no quarrel with the German people," Mr. Anthony Eden said rather unoriginally in a recent radio address on behalf of His Majesty's Government. Why, asks the Opposition, should the Empire have maintained so long and desperate a quarrel with the interests of its own people, the so-called submerged classes as well as the subject races outside the island? The answer is that the manipulators of British politics have refused again and again to recognize the really democratic mind in England just as they refused to recognize it in the early English colonists in America. And now while England is busily occupied in having no quarrel with the German people, the voices of her deeply convinced social reformers who link pacifism and social transformation as "inseparable"

* An article presenting a contrary point of view will be published next week.

will be stilled as completely as like voices in Germany have been for the past six years.

Joining of the F.O.R. (Fellowship of Reconciliation) will hardly be the done thing for some time in Britain. This peacetime group was founded in 1914 in England; in twenty-five years it has proselyted members in twenty countries, and has more than 8,000 bona fide joiners in America. The first and second articles of belief of the F.O.R. are listed as follows in the Fellowship's "Statement of Purpose":

They refuse to participate in any war, or to sanction military preparation; they work to abolish war and to foster good will among nations, races and classes;

They strive to build a social order which will suffer no individual or group to be exploited for the profit or pleasure of another, and which will assure to all the means for realizing the best possibilities of life.

In 1936 the International Fellowship launched a project called "Embassies of Reconciliation." George Lansbury, one of the founders of the F.O.R. and former leader of the British Labor Party, visited heads of almost all the states of Europe and that of the United States, urging "world conference instead of war."

"Union Now"

Before war shut the mouths of the British Opposition (in effect) there was printed an outspoken declaration of the attitude of this group toward the government in a review of Clarence Streit's much-discussed "Union Now" in the *Adelphi Magazine* for July, 1939. The reviewer, Mr. George Orwell, told Britishers exactly what is wrong with Mr. Streit's plan, which proposed a ganging up of the "democracies," the United States, Britain, France and so on, against the dictatorships. The others would be, said Mr. Orwell, simply supplying "the British and French empires, with their six hundred million disenfranchised human beings," with better police forces. "The huge strength of the USA," he went on, "would be behind the robbery of India and Africa. Mr. Streit is letting cats out of bags, but *all* phrases like 'Peace Bloc,' 'Peace Front,' contain some such implication; all imply a tightening of the existing structure. The unspoken clause is always 'not counting niggers.' For how can we make a 'firm stand' against Hitler if we are simultaneously weakening ourselves at home? In other words, how can we 'fight Fascism' except by bolstering up a far vaster injustice?"

Suppose the airplanes so active lately in dropping pamphlets over the Rhineland should scatter in British dooryards Mr. Orwell's brave and honest challenge? As if his speech had not already been plain enough he amplified somewhat on the idea of vaster injustice within the Empire:

For of course it is vaster. What we always forget is that the overwhelming bulk of the British proletariat does not live in Britain, but in Asia and Africa. It is not in Hitler's power, for instance, to make a penny an hour a normal industrial wage; it is perfectly normal in India, and we are at great pains to keep it so. One gets some idea of the real relationship of England and India when one reflects that the per capita annual income in England is something over 80 pounds, and in India about 7 pounds. It is quite common for an Indian coolie's leg to be thinner than the average Englishman's arm. And there is nothing racial in this, for well-fed members of the same races are of normal physique; it is due to simple starvation. This is the system which we all live on, and which we denounce when there seems to be no danger of its being altered. Of late, however, it has become the first duty of a "good anti-fascist" to lie about it and help to keep it in being.

"What meaning would there be," Mr. Orwell demanded, "even if it were successful, in bringing down Hitler's system in order to stabilize something that is far bigger and in its different way just as bad? But apparently, for lack of any real opposition, this is going to be our objective." This prediction was written sometime before the outbreak of war with Germany was felt as anything like immediate. The writer, nonetheless, foresaw that "Hitler's move will be to feel for a weak spot or an unguarded moment," and that war-mindedness would descend precipitously on England. Further than this the pessimistic reviewer did not prophesy.

Mobilising decency

What George Orwell did see when he wrote his eloquent diatribe against His Majesty's Government in July was that "The downward slide is happening because nearly all the Socialist leaders, when it comes to the pinch, are merely His Majesty's Opposition, and nobody else knows how to mobilise the decency of the English people, which one meets with everywhere when one talks to human beings instead of reading newspapers." And the outstanding fact in Mr. Orwell's bold speaking is just that this decency (which has found more than one voice in the last centuries of England's darkly chequered history) has *not* been mobilised. England had lost her own war before taking up arms against the arch foe of democracy in Germany.

The Nazi emphasis on race and nationality, the Germans' belief in themselves as leaders in the realm of ideals, the German stress on war as an ethnic communal value are even more deplorable than they were before Goering's terrible Fuehrer and his minions marched into Polish territory several months ago. No one doubts the righteousness of civilization's denunciation of deliberate attempts by Germany to establish a nation

on such principles as glorification of war and apotheosis of the old German ways. Race, war, overemphasis on nationalism are not structural but destructive elements in any political organization. Yet each of these three aspects of Nazism has been—as Hitler has frequently pointed out in attempts to justify Germany—a prime factor in Britain's imperial injustices. And they remain ugly prototypes of Nazism.

A quarter of a century ago a homesick Englishman in America wrote the stanza:

Honour England! Who would not
Be her son or daughter
In that little garden plot
Natured by the water?
We will foes defy for her
We will self deny for her
We will fight and die for her—
England is our mother!

The tragedy of England is that her real foes have never been all faced and defied; England's people no more than Germany's have been able to cope with the enemies whose stronghold is their own government. M. André Maurois in his five-hundred-page eulogy of Britain, "The Miracle of England," said in his concluding chapter that the deeper unity of this nation appears indestructible, and this he attributes to English adaptability and English conservatism. According to M. Maurois, England's history "is that of one of mankind's outstanding successes." One third of this planet is under her control; successively she wrested the mastery of the seas from Spain, France, Holland and Germany. But the honest historian must ask: What price these "successes"? All the fighting and dying for England in this present cataclysm multiplies the casualties in wars already lost. The single-handed threat to democracy in England is not Hitler in 1940, any more than it was Wilhelm II in 1914. Is it His Majesty's Government? Or that ally of selfish ambition, Social Lag? Are not these, in the language of the Barbier de Séville, "*deux soeurs qui portent le même nom*"?

A Labor School Takes Inventory

By VINCENT J. McLAUGHLIN

ON THURSDAY evening, December 14, in the beautiful library building of the College of New Rochelle, the most recent labor school inaugurated by the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists held its last class of the fall term. Under the critical supervision of faculty and guests the labor school was evaluated in a three hour session conducted solely by the students who

selected their own chairman, topics and discussion leaders. The results of that meeting convinced even the most skeptical observers that labor is anxious and willing to learn if opportunities are provided and men of high intellectual character are willing to cooperate.

The school was begun in October under the direction of Father Joseph N. Moody, Instructor at Cathedral College. The staff consisted of the Reverend Thomas Darby of Cathedral College, Dr. John T. Farrell and the writer, both of the College of New Rochelle. Classes were held weekly and attendance was optional. Anyone interested in labor problems regardless of race, color or creed was welcome, the purpose being to explain Catholic principles on labor from the basis of common sense and experience rather than from authority. After ten weeks of instruction and discussion the students conducted their own last meeting and evaluated the entire program.

Could anything be accomplished in the short space of ten meetings by such a course open to all but utilized mainly by adults who had not received formal instruction in years? An examination of the topics selected for discussion by the students supplied the answer. The program opened with a labor delegate speaking on "Samuel Gompers"; a painter followed discussing "T. V. Powderly"; the President of a Steamfitters Union spoke on "The First Society"; a laundry supervisor defined "Labor Ethics"; a clothing clerk continued with the topic, "John Mitchell"; a steamfitter explained "How to Address People"; a tile layer commented on "What is Man"; and a milk driver closed the program with "The Value of Public Speaking in the Average Union." The students then conducted an open forum and evaluated their own reactions to the course. Their unanimous agreement was that a clearer but in no way complete understanding of labor principles had resulted. The Chairman speaking for the group then indicated that the students desired an elaboration of labor ethics and history of labor for the spring term with the addition of parliamentary law and procedure to supplement the public speaking course. Guests who had attended only the first and last sessions of the school expressed their amazement at the knowledge and confidence displayed by men who only a few weeks before were awed and in many cases frightened to find themselves in a class room.

One of the most interesting disclosures of the evening concerned a woman student, Susan Bradley, President of the Domestic Workers Union Local 130 of Westchester County. She decided on the course as a means of acquiring a theoretical knowledge of labor principles to supplement her valuable experience. A few years ago Mrs. Bradley received a position in an employment agency where she became familiar and sympathetic with the exploitation of domestic workers. After sur-

mounting many obstacles she organized a union of domestic workers in Westchester County and was recognized by the American Federation of Labor. Mrs. Bradley declared that as a result of her studies at the Labor School she did not hesitate two months ago to accept an invitation to speak in New York City before 1,400 delegates at the New York State Convention of the American Federation of Labor. With such a start Mrs. Bradley feels that the domestic workers, as yet not generally recognized in labor circles, will eventually achieve better working conditions.

If the evaluations of guests, faculty and students serve as criteria, then the Labor School is unquestionably a successful venture. There are several elements in the school program that may account for its enthusiastic reception by students.

The first and most important factor is the general attitude of the learner and the teacher toward labor problems. The desire to learn manifested by students whose previous education is limited and the willingness of the faculty to satisfy that desire establishes a common meeting ground productive of results.

Another important aspect of the program is the heterogeneous character of the student body which insures a composite picture of labor conditions. Nineteen individual labor unions were represented by 102 students of both sexes. Twenty-seven non-union members, two of whom were lawyers interested in the promotion of labor defense, were included in the total registration. Among the unions having members at the Labor School were the Amalgamated Utility Workers, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, American Federation of Musicians, Bakers, Carpenters, Commercial Artists, Bricklayers, Masons, Plasterers, Bookkeepers, Secretaries, Business Agents, Milk Drivers and Teamsters, International Ladies Garment Workers, Domestic Workers Union, Lathers, Tile Layers, Painters, Plumbers, Steamfitters, Engineer Systems and Printers.

The school program itself is attractive to the student. Although formal instruction occupies the first half hour of the forty-five minute period, the meetings are adult in character and ample time for questions, discussions and explanations is an essential part of every course. The public speaking course requires active participation by every student in the class as either speaker, critic, chairman or discussion leader. With five minute intervals between periods, the entire evening consumes only two hours and ten minutes.

On the basis of this simple organization the labor school is producing a clearer concept of Catholic principles on labor. The immediate results have pleased us; the ultimate results can only be measured when labor and capital realize their mutual dependency on each other and class warfare based on conflict of labor and capital takes its place with outmoded things of history.

Views & Reviews

BY MICHAEL WILLIAMS

THE OBJECTIONS raised by spokesmen for the Baptists and the Lutherans to President Roosevelt's appointment of a personal representative to the Vatican contrast sharply and strongly with the approval voiced by so many other representatives of Protestant and Jewish groups. Naturally enough, Catholic opinion, so far as it has been publicly expressed, rejoices in the President's action. It is glad also that what appears to be the largest and predominant weight of Protestant and Jewish opinion should be emphatically favorable to the President's plan. It is of course most likely that Catholic opinion, as expressed in the Catholic press, will find the Baptist and Lutheran opposition disturbing and discouraging. That organized atheism—so far as it is represented by Mr. Joseph Lewis's group—should express similar views, though for other reasons, to those held by the Lutheran and Baptist spokesmen was to have been expected.

It is indeed lamentable that powerful portions of the organized Protestant denominations should part company with their own Protestant brethren on this momentous issue. As Catholics, however, we are under a great obligation to be entirely fair in our judgments and utterances. For those Protestants for whom the Catholic Church still seems to be what at one time—and that not a remote period—nearly all Protestants considered her to be, namely, the Church of Anti-Christ, reasonable discussion of Papal influence is impossible. We must remember that on the eve of our own age, even so towering a light of Catholic Christianity as Cardinal Newman had himself, before his conversion, shared in that traditional Protestant view of the Church. However, it is certain that today the number of sincere Protestants to whom the Catholic Church really appears to be positively evil cannot be large nor influential. It would seem that by far the largest and most influential number are most willing to cooperate with Catholics, individually or corporately, in all matters where their common belief in God's Fatherhood, and mankind's consequent fraternal relationship, provides the basis for an agreement for action that does not compromise respective doctrinal loyalties. But we must clearly and dispassionately recognize that among Protestants, and Jews as well, there are large numbers who draw the line, or are strongly inclined to do so, at cooperating with Catholics in any joint effort that may even seem to infringe upon the domain of complete separation that should, in their view, exist between the powers and activities of our government and those of the organized religious groups.

That the President has endangered this principle of separation of Church and State seems to be the fear felt by the spokesmen for the Baptists and the Lutherans who have been quoted in the press. Such fears should be respected by Catholics. To a very great extent indeed we have the best of reasons for sharing them. History is full of the grim and terrible and deplorable results for the Church and her children that have come from the

wrong sort of union, or even association, of Church and State; sometimes when the Church in question was Protestant, sometimes when it was the Catholic Church. Some of the worst of these evils came from rulers and statesmen and politicians professing Catholicism but using their political power to make the Church their instrument, for personal or governmental aims, often highly obnoxious aims.

Nevertheless we also realize that much of the manifest distress of our times has come from the evil growth of indifference to religion on the part of governments separated from all alliance, as well as legal unity, with the organized churches. Indeed, it is the root evil of our modern age. Most Protestants and Jews recognize this fact as clearly as do thinking Catholics. Our common task, therefore, is to work out a practical solution of this fundamental problem through discussion and study and experiment. And the atmosphere in which that effort will have any chance for success must be kept clear of anger and prejudiced contention against or with mere bigots or fanatics. And if we ask, as we do, that the position of the Church in regard to this momentous issue should be studied with good will, we too must display good will, particularly towards those who honestly disagree with us.

As I have several times said before, in this column and elsewhere, the growing movement toward collaboration among religious people of different creeds, especially in regard to the problems of war and peace among nations, must inevitably lead to the re-discovery and re-appraisal of the great work of the English, or, rather, Scottish, Protestant, David Urquhart, who in spite of tremendous handicaps led a movement seventy years ago which was a precursor of today's. He organized English Protestants who petitioned the Pope (Pius IX) to take the lead in restoring international law as superior to and binding upon the laws of separate nations. Not only that, but Urquhart, with the Pope's approval and blessing, got up a similar petition signed by more than one hundred Catholic Bishops to the same effect. This action caused the whole great question to be placed upon the agenda of the Vatican Council, Urquhart himself being mainly responsible for drafting the necessary documents that were to have been dealt with by the Council. Tragically, however, the guns of the Franco-German War, and of the Italian assault upon Papal Rome, caused the abrupt suspension of the Council before the Fathers of the Church could reach Urquhart's topic. The anarchy of conflicting secular national strife and jealousy resumed its sway over the world, and today it seems supreme over all moral law; Chaos has usurped the throne of Order.

It is deeply interesting to remember that David Urquhart's monumental work—which only seemed to fail, for its roots were fixed in truth and are rising again today—to which his long life was wholly devoted, was inspired by a Mohammedan peasant-soldier. This member of the Church of England who won over to his crusade for the universal moral law scores of Catholic prelates and of Protestant leaders was, so he related, "convicted of the sin of murder in unjust war" by a Turkish soldier who explained to him why he, the soldier, and his companions had allowed themselves to be driven out of a redoubt by

Russian soldiers without resistance. It was because war had not been declared by the lawful Turkish authorities; therefore, to kill their enemies would have been plain murder. Urquhart, says his biographer, "whose own hands were reddened with blood of men with whom his country was not at war (he had fought against the Turks in the Greek war of independence)," spent the rest of his life in atonement by working for the cause of re-establishing international law.

Communications

JUST WAR

New York, N. Y.

TO the Editors: In common, I have no doubt, with many other ordinary folk, who are neither philosophers nor theologians, but who have been led to suppose that Jacques Maritain had some competence in those fields, I am disturbed to be informed by Mr. John Kelly (December 29) that M. Maritain lacks "focus" on "the objective realities" of the European war, that his statements are "politically naïve and theologically unsound" and finally that he has "confused his cultural with his religious affinities."

Not having sufficient scholarship to weigh for myself the texts which Mr. Kelly advances in proof of these strictures, I am left in the attitude of "something approaching dismay," but with a desire for more light on the dispute.

Could THE COMMONWEAL persuade M. Etienne Gilson, for example, to express an opinion on the views expressed by Mr. Kelly and M. Maritain? Or Dr. Gerald Phelan of the Toronto Institute of Medieval Studies—which, by the way, has recently been raised to the dignity of a Pontifical Institute? It would be comforting to me, at least, as I am sure it would be to many others, who—up to now—have regarded M. Maritain with no little respect, not to say reverence, to have a competent referee pass on the argument.

Meanwhile, I would be grateful to Mr. Kelly if he would tell us whether or not he thinks it our duty as Catholics to regard the military outcome of the war as of no consequence to either the Catholic Church or the thing we commonly call the "Western civilization." Some of us have rather definite views and we would like to know whether we are right.

THOMAS F. WOODLOCK.

New York, N. Y.

TO the Editors: The practice of THE COMMONWEAL in presenting two sides to the war in Europe is a rare treat. It is fair evidence that THE COMMONWEAL is open to all just appraisals of the war; because it must be obvious by now that there is more than one aspect to enter into a consideration of justice. I can see eye-to-eye with M. Maritain's presentation of his cause when he is speaking as a patriot-philosopher (October 13, November 24, December 22). I can see eye-to-eye with Mr. Kelly's condemnation of the cause when he is arguing as an "extremist"-perfectionist (December 29). I remain indifferent when the patriot disregards the perfectionist. But I can never see eye-to-eye with the perfectionist who

condemns the patriot. And in all this I prefer to use the expression, "sentire cum Roma," that sobriety which tempers condemnation, whether in disapproval of the aggressor or defender, and which prefers to expend its energies in favor of peace.

This is not the maudlin peace-at-any-price of those who have not suffered one way or the other from what has happened so far. Nor is it the futile peace-with-honor of the vanquished who carry war beyond their means.

For Rome (if a layman may venture to interpret her position) acts wisely in positing a foundation for peace based on temporal satisfaction without losing hold of its converse that if divergent demands must give way to mutual agreement, temporal satisfaction must be subordinate so spiritual rights.

Too often the pacifist in condemning war condemns the sinner who bears arms. Some would leave them to the dogs. Would it be too much to mention that no less a kindhearted author (I presume that all authors are kindhearted) as Virginia Wolf would even refuse to dress the wounds of a soldier? I only wish to infer from this that pacifists, to my limited intellectual capacities, sacrifice a certain amount of proper emotion. Therefore when Mr. John Kelly in his "Reply to Jacques Maritain" *painfully* decries that our Thomist has abandoned his proper spouse and fled into the arms of Mars through the sweet wiles of his country, I find it highly entertaining how Mr. Kelly juggles *De divinis institutionibus*, *Apologia I pro Christianis*, *De Idolatria*, *Contra Faustum*, etc., without once alluding to any of the conditions present in the European arena. If he is trying to prove by Scripture, the Fathers and Doctors of the Church that war should not be, I grant that he might make many highly emotional over the grandeur of a perpetual peace on earth because *de Institutionibus*, etc., say so.

If I had the proper Latin background, I'm sure I could find somewhere in *de something* by a highly reputable doctor that under certain conditions war would be recommended. As it is I do recall that in her divine office the Church daily sings forth the name of Melchisedech in a graceful cadence, because he once made an offering to celebrate the success of a great military expedition. Yet it would be a calamity to infer from the acts of this precursor of the Prince of Peace that all wars are justifiable.

And yet, while we are still under the spell of this Holy Season, we must remember that the peace of nations is not the same thing as the peace of Christ. If we have been taught that no earthly force can dislodge the peace of Christ for it is secret in the inaccessible principality of Christ—in the hearts of the faithful, then we may find it in the heart of a German peasant, or in the heart of his son killed this morning at the front, or in the heart of the Englishman from whose gun came the fatal bullet.

RALPH J. MASIELLO.

TO the Editors: Speaking of the Christian martyrs of the first centuries in connection with Maritain's articles on the just war does not imply at all, as "A Commonweal Reader" (December 22) seems to think, that one entertains the notion that "Christian martyrs

were Tolstoyans." The value of the situation lies, it seems to me, not in proving that a theory or a given attitude prevailed at a specific time but in facing an historical fact—namely that the triumph of Christianity over paganism was won by the blood of the martyrs. The question which may interest us is one of method. We are confronted by a successful technique in breaking the power of oppression. Though one may be fully aware that the premises are not identical, he may still wonder if another method of dealing with any form of oppression will work. It is a question, which, considering the panorama of history, may well be asked. When has violence succeeded against violence?

As far as accepting the previous piracies of other nations as "closed issues," it is convenient, but is it just? And, again, does it work?

It is extremely difficult not to be swayed either by a personal feeling in favor of one nation or by an exaggerated sense of guilt. But, in the present state of the world is it not our duty to ponder Tertullian's words to the Roman government? As "A Commonweal Reader" truthfully said, he included the army. Why not? Only those who look in the Gospel for the justification of a ready-made political, social or ethical theory might be surprised. Even we find that Tertullian is bold enough to speak of war against the Roman government. But is it not worth while going to the end of the paragraph, which reads as follows: "We are a people of yesterday and yet we have filled every place belonging to you, cities, islands, castles, town assemblies, your very camp, your tribes, companies, palaces, senate, forums. We leave you your temples only. We can count your armies, and our numbers in a single province will be greater. In what war with you should we not be sufficient and ready, even though unequal in numbers, who so willingly are put to death, if it were not in this Religion of ours more lawful to be slain than to slay?"

CLAIRE HUCHET BISHOP.

Reading, Pa.

TO the Editors: M. Maritain's letter (November 24, see also issue of December 22) is very interesting, and the reasons for his conclusions are lucidly presented. But I think there are one or two points he has overlooked, the consideration of which changes the complexion of the present war in Europe.

M. Maritain declares at the outset that he believes the present war to be neither an ideological nor a holy war, but he does believe it to be a just war. Giving secondary place to the remoter origins of the war, to which the failings of all the combatants contributed, M. Maritain stresses the point that the decisive cause of the war (and this is what determines its justice) was the adhesion of Britain and France to a promise made to a people "which is a victim of savage aggression," and their "decision to resist, at the cost of blood, a boundless will to domination which recognizes neither good faith nor respect for treaties nor respect for elementary human rights. . . ."

In all good faith I cannot help but think that this argument is opportune and specious rather than fundamentally true. In one sense, of course, it is true, viz., that Britain and France did make such a decision. But the argument

ignores completely the reasons for the so-called "savage aggression." Just here lies its intrinsic weakness. Because the argument supposes that Germany had other courses open to her which would have brought her the same results, it obliquely implies that she would have been granted justice had she but asked for it. Yet I do not see how anyone can admit this. . . . Germany acted as she did, and has right along acted as she did, simply because no other course was open to her if she wished to re-establish herself and to right the evils growing out of Versailles.

In support of this contention I present the following: the injustice of the conditions embodied in the Versailles Treaty (these arose from Clemenceau's avowed hatred of Germany and from Britain's fear of a major European trade rival and power; have people already forgotten that Britain supported Germany in the Franco-Prussian war, but hastily switched her support to France after that war disclosed Germany's power?); and the continued refusal, on the part of Britain principally, to ameliorate in any way the unbearable conditions in Germany. . . .

Britain and France did not worry about fidelity to a promise in the case of Czechoslovakia: they were not prepared and were forced to accede. Are the moral obligations of a promise based upon political opportunism? Should we value their word if they aver the Munich Pact to have been a purely humanitarian act on their part? . . .

If we wish to determine the cause of the present war these facts can not be thrust aside, nor can the historical events leading to the war be conveniently scrapped. And the justice of that war must rest on these facts and not alone upon an isolated item which was more the product of enforced conditions than of disinterested and noble adherence to a promise. . . .

At no time since Versailles has Germany received just treatment from Britain and France without severe pressure. Must we, then, assume that Germany has a "boundless will to domination"? We simply do not know. Nor do we know what would have been Germany's attitude had the injustice of the Versailles Treaty been rectified.

I think therefore that M. Maritain's reasons for declaring the present war to be just are unsound and unwarranted by historical fact. . . . The only claim it can make for justice lies in opposition to the principles of Nazism. And if these are not the issue, I do not see how claim can be reasonably made for a just war.

The question is complicated because two (and from the Christian standpoint, conflicting) elements enter into it. The one is the question of Germany's political rights and the rectification of the Versailles Treaty: on this ground I think Germany's case is just and irrefutable. The other element is Nazism which darkens and overshadows the political case of Germany, and which has been exploited by propaganda to the exclusion of the true political aspect.

If we must oppose some of the principles of Nazism, it does not follow that we must befog the question of Germany's political rights. An effort must be made to distinguish every factor, else bias will cramp opinion. It is the unusually large and distinct mixture of right and wrong in Germany's case which makes a just decision so difficult to reach. I think it a grievous philosophical sur-

render for anyone to fail or refuse to make those distinctions.

If the present war is neither ideological nor holy, I repeat that I do not think it can be called just, i.e., politically just. . . .

WILLIAM J. METER.

New York, N. Y.

TO the Editors: I am writing you to protest your publication of the article "Reply to Jacques Maritain" which appeared in the issue of December 20. Jacques Maritain is a Catholic philosopher of world wide fame. Professor for over twenty-five years at the Institut Catholique de Paris, he has lectured also in Italy, Spain, Canada, Brazil and at many of the best universities of the United States. He is the author of more than twenty books, many of which have been translated into English, German, Italian, Spanish and Japanese. Maritain is without doubt the most widely known contemporary exponent of the philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas and, in the opinion of many, the most effective apostle of Christian thought in modern times. THE COMMONWEAL has published several of Maritain's important papers including two recent articles and one letter in which he stated his views on the present European war.

These views have been misinterpreted by some persons who lack either the competence or the desire to understand what Maritain has written. One of these is a John Kelly, author of a "Reply to Jacques Maritain" (THE COMMONWEAL, December 29, 1939). Mr. Kelly, THE COMMONWEAL tells its readers, is "a contributor to various reviews and periodicals living in New Haven, Conn." Mr. Kelly's article deserves attention only because of the importance of the man whose views he distorts and misrepresents.

In publishing this article the editors of THE COMMONWEAL have grievously failed in their responsibility to their readers and in justice to Maritain. Mr. Kelly's article purports to be an answer to Maritain's first two contributions about the war in the issues of September 30 and October 30. Editorial responsibility demands, to say the least, that such a reply be founded upon an adequate understanding of the sense of the previously published material. A checking of the Kelly article against the Maritain articles shows that Mr. Kelly has seriously misinterpreted Maritain's views and has misused Maritain's statements.

Some of Mr. Kelly's charges against Maritain are that he has sacrificed his reason by entering "into the atmosphere of the present war . . . with alacrity and enthusiasm," that his "statements are . . . theologically unsound," that Maritain "has confused his cultural with his religious affinities."

I urge anyone who has taken these charges seriously to re-read the Maritain articles and discover for himself how absurd the charges are. Mr. Kelly himself fails to establish any one of the charges in his own article.

A further article of at least the length of the one by Mr. Kelly is required to show how he has failed to substantiate the grave charges which he has made. I am prepared to furnish such an article immediately.

WILLIAM O'MEARA.

The Stage & Screen

Kindred

PAUL VINCENT CARROLL in "Shadow and Substance" and "The White Steed" trod firmly along the pathway to the stars, but in "Kindred" he has slipped off. If he had only landed on the firm earth he might have saved himself. But he didn't, and the consequence is that he finds himself being whirled about in space with his brain completely addled. The reason is very evident—he has become afflicted with a Messianic complex. He wants to save the world unaided by reliance on the religion which gave his two former plays at once their substance and their aim. And how does he want to save the world? By giving it into the hands of the artist! Mr. Carroll distrusts the business man and hates the politicians, and taken at their mean he may be justified. But there are business men who have been philanthropists and politicians who have become statesmen. As for the artist at the helm of human affairs, we have one very much in evidence at present in Adolf Hitler. Now Hitler may be a very mediocre painter, but in temperament and character he is much like the two ghosts, and at least one of the two living men, to whom in "Kindred" Mr. Carroll hands the torch which is to light the world. One of these ghosts is a wife murderer, and the other a suicide, while the living man despite his dreams is a brute and becomes a suicide. The fourth of Mr. Carroll's saviors is a lazy peripatetic hedge-hopping fiddler blessed, or cursed, with the gift of the gab. It is almost as if Mr. Carroll, after insisting on the artist as savior, had impishly set out to show us how ridiculous his thesis is!

Now there is beautiful and eloquent writing in "Kindred" and there is humor, for is not the author of the play Paul Vincent Carroll, who with Sean O'Casey can write as no other living dramatists can? But just as Mr. O'Casey went astray when he got his feet off the Irish sod, so Mr. Carroll has gone haywire when he writes a play without the ennobling and restraining influence of the Church. "Kindred" is Mr. Carroll's "Within the Gates." Both Mr. Carroll and Mr. O'Casey seem to have forgotten that what has made their plays unique is not that they are geniuses who owe nothing to anyone outside themselves, but that they are two talented writers whose roots deep in their native soil have sucked up the experience and the poetry of their race. Tear up their roots and they become two very bewildered human beings whose sap soon runs dry. Within the magnificent structure of the Church and enriched by its informing spirit Mr. Carroll wrote two of the most significant plays of modern times. There were indeed touches in his writing even then of the sin of spiritual pride, but they were only touches. But in "Kindred" that sin is very much in evidence. Mr. Carroll needs once more to become humble.

The cast is an excellent one, and Aline MacMahon is really magnificent in her simple dignity as the Mother.

Hers is one of the most exquisite creations I have seen in modern acting. Barry Fitzgerald is as always inimitable, Arthur Shields admirable as the hedge-hopping fiddler, Aileen O'Conner humorously charming as the shop assistant and Wauna Paul properly grotesque as a half-wit. Only Wallace Ford as the poet in the Prologue is miscast. (*At Maxine Elliott's Theatre.*) GRENVILLE VERNON.

From Library to Hollywood for a Second Time

VICTOR HUGO probably meant no good by the Church when he wrote "The Hunchback of Notre Dame." However this second filming of the book gives the Church an even break, except for implications of backwardness, and allows Good, personified by the Archbishop (Walter Hampden), to win finally over Evil personified by the bigoted, lustful High Justice (Cedric Hardwicke). Even hideous Quasimodo, the epitome of bodily malformation, who first serves the High Justice, later turns on him. Charles Laughton's performance seems static principally because it has difficulty coming through the most repulsive make-up that has ever been used in a film. The doctrine of fascination in ugliness that is propounded is exemplified in him. Laughton's shocking face becomes fascinating when it radiates with kindness as he administers to the beautiful gypsy girl, Esmeralda (Maureen O'Hara). But the scene that establishes a new high in horror, and this is in a picture that is packed with shuddering, fifteenth-century terrors, is that in which the hunchback, surrounded by a mean mob before the Cathedral, is stripped and lashed at the pillory. William Dieterle has also directed powerful scenes of beauty and excitement, as when Quasimodo swings from the Cathedral to rescue Esmeralda from the hangman while the music swells to a great height, and later when the surging mob of beggars storms the Cathedral. Rest assured; "The Hunchback" is not dull.

Rudyard Kipling's "The Light That Failed" may have seemed interestingly alive when it was written, but now its third film, which is faithfully done and well acted, seems very last century and stodgy. The opening, with the English in Sudan, again in square formation fighting the Fuzzy-Wuzzies, and the finale in which Dick rides madly across a gorgeous desert right into the face of the enemy are pointlessly heroic. But the scenes that glow are those in which the artist, whose war paintings were "distinguished for vigor and realism," allows money success to turn his head to easy applause, much to the disgust of his reporter-friend. Inspiration comes to Dick when he sees life's reality in the vulgar street-walker (vividly portrayed by Ida Lupino) whom he paints as his masterpiece just before the darkness of permanent blindness descends upon him. Luminous-eyed Ronald Colman builds up an astonishing poignancy in the scenes of Dick's blindness—a feeling that is accentuated by the kindness of his friend (Walter Huston), the desertion of self-centered Maisie and the final thoughtless deed of the cheap street girl. William A. Wellman has directed this picture carefully; it's too bad that it had to have a beginning and end.

E. W. Hornung probably made more money out of "The Amateur Cracksman" than Raffles himself made out

of his shady deeds. The super sportsman, super safe cracker is back to annoy Scotland Yard. David Niven's "Raffles," like John Barrymore's of some years ago, is a brilliant, brittle, clever chap who wins your sympathy, and Olivia de Havilland's heart, in spite of his thievery. Samuel Goldwyn's trivial production makes intelligent light entertainment; and Sam Wood's direction of the two leads and Dame May Whitty and Dudley Digges will keep you amused through suspense that is tense and giggley.

PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

The Wind Blows

WHEN FOLK hand down the wise saw that prudent men will hate and fear police departments and newspapers, they do well. So far THE COMMONWEAL hasn't had much trouble with our own police, although years ago the police department of a foreign nation cut off sales in the Greater Reich. Up to now, around here we have been more worried about the sheriff.

But papers—and magazines—we detest with a great and growing fervor which purely competitive considerations could never fire. And of all periodicals, our special 200 proof venom is right now being spit at the New York *World-Telegram*, toward which we feel a distilled animus just one technicality removed from libel, slander and criminal threat.

The day after New Year's, battered and bruised and not too bright after expeditions to annual meetings of organizations and to more pleasant but no less exhausting ski trails, we were trying to do two days' work in one, safe in our sheltered office. In mid-morning some blackly cursed hired hand of Scripps-Howard telephoned this office. The Editors being occupied, the call was switched to the innocent, amiable, apparently dreaming and certainly at the time befuddled managing editor.

This creative reporter had apparently decided he had a news story about "Gone with the Wind," which picture very evidently has a massive advertising budget and is news. Also the chance of hitting the Legion of Decency. The reviewer of the Communists' *Daily Worker* had lost a job because he refused to "blister" the movie as cruelly as the party line decreed was proper. Now THE COMMONWEAL reviewer had praised it and the Legion of Decency later came out with a line giving it only a "B" rating, "objectionable in part." The *World-Telegram* vulture was flapping around to see if our Mr. Hartung would be offered as a parallel sacrifice.

"Harry Lorin Binsse, managing editor of THE COMMONWEAL," as is his grossly wasteful custom, chatted too much and too agreeably with this reporter—informally, personally, with no commission from THE COMMONWEAL and with no idea that the affair would go further than a ten cent (or maybe fifteen cent) call paid for by the bloated press. Believing he was spiking the story in its heel, he brought out approximately five points:

1. Hartung in THE COMMONWEAL went out of his way to indicate a certain laxness in G.W.T.W., giving it a moral characterization that fits in with the Legion rating, so no conflict such as appeared in the *Worker* was in existence with us. This was Binsse's principal and reiterated

point. 2. THE COMMONWEAL critic writes his piece before the Legion ratings are out, and if on occasions there is a discrepancy, ostracism is not the immediate consequence. 3. In regard to movie reviews, there is no Catholic "party line" which constitutes a test of orthodoxy. 4. In theatre criticism (as distinguished here from movies), for the most part the conclusion about moral "healthiness" is fairly obvious. For the borderline cases the Cardinal Hayes White List of Plays frequently (within this special minority) differs from previous reviews in THE COMMONWEAL and other Catholic reviewers. 5. The public play and movie lists of organizations working under the Catholic hierarchy are produced for all the public at once. Their purpose is primarily to furnish a guide of moral health. This magazine, like others, is published for only a small and fairly homogeneous group (much too small and not half homogeneous enough). It was particularly stressed that the function of our criticism is not to assume the position of final moral judge, but more to comment on the whole movie—interest, art and all that.

Well, when the day passed and one got home to tend to one's rest and relaxation, the *World-Telegram* announced a slight drama in progress with THE COMMONWEAL taking a principal part, and one was confronted with a tactless and altogether incomprehensible interview which one had never heard about, misstating the policy of THE COMMONWEAL with purported direct quotes from one who would not, except on definite commission, state COMMONWEAL policy. In the morning, scavenging on a scavenger, the New York *Daily News* carried on the deformed and revolting misrepresentation.

Now, COMMONWEAL policy favors the Legion of Decency. In some particular churches, the high-handed manner in which the local priest sandbags the people into the pledge to avoid bad films and palaces which habitually feature them is distasteful to us. But in the important endeavor to minimize the evil effects of a dangerous medium and habit, we have done our best to support the Legion, and feel it has done extremely well. That the bishops have the right and duty to guide the movie-going of Catholics who accept and welcome their teaching authority is American, democratic, Christian and good sense. (If we were rating the movies, a lot more of them would be called objectionable, condemned, unfortunate and lousy, especially for adults.)

The *World-Telegram* in its deft and Mafia manner manufactured quite a split between THE COMMONWEAL and the official Catholic listing agencies. One particularly helpful subhead declared that we "Disagreed with Cardinal Hayes." This gem of whole cloth (if you don't mind mixing them) was where our *World-Telegram* colleague got after picking at point "4" above. THE COMMONWEAL suffers enough from the suspicious misconception among its most likely audience that it may not sufficiently respect and heed its intellectual, moral and spiritual betters, and first of all the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, without the irresponsible *World-Telegram* falsely and with a feline callousness scratching out new pitfalls. We don't like the *World-Telegram*. For today that is official policy.

COMMONWEAL reviewers—movie, play, book and music

—have an admirable amount of freedom. What they sign is not the magazine's "policy," and, for the *n*th time, this magazine's policy does not masquerade as the "official policy" of the Catholic Church. If we should find our reviewers repeatedly going off at angles, we would try to check up or replace them.

So, Siberia for Scripps-Howard, and at least southern Siberia for the *News*! COMMONWEAL readers will please note that they should teach their children to loath newspapers. Read the copy of Philip Hartung with an honest eye and you will not be led to perdition. Harry Lorin Binsse is our first candidate for America's first concentration camp. If the *World-Telegram* wants, we are willing to come over and help with a quick purge there right now. As for THE COMMONWEAL, it has been suggested that what it needs is fewer and better editors. And meaner and more suspicious.

THE EDITORS.

In the Groove

TIMELY RECORDS, INC., is, so far as I know, the most egregious one-man show in the recording trade. I do not know whether its activator, Mr. Leo Waldman, is making a fortune out of it; I believe it is a side-line to his insurance business. Mr. Waldman is a man of ideas. He first put on discs the delightful symphonies of the eighteenth century British composer William Boyce; he immortalized, for what that is worth, Edward Markham in *The Man with the Hoe* and other poems; his most recent fancy has been to assort some *Piano Fantasias*, by composers as dissimilar as Haydn and Shostakovich, in an album by Grace Castagnetta.

Now comes Mr. Waldman with a new notion. He has made a single disc of a C major Mozart piano sonata (the one which furnished the basis for the recent popular tune, *In an Eighteenth Century Drawing Room*); and you will look in vain for an artist's name on its label. On the theory that "the music, not the performer, is of first importance," Mr. Waldman is keeping his artist's identity a secret. Mr. (or Miss) Blank plays this sonata with becoming modesty. Future anonymous releases, by more mettlesome piano writers, will furnish a harder test for him, or her. Why should not this idea be carried further? It would be interesting to have a series of recordings labeled simply "Music," and publishing out-of-the-way works which amateurs might not readily identify. The labels might be supplied at some later date.

Johann Christian Bach, firstborn of the 18 children of the mighty Johann Sebastian, is little represented on records. His graceful *Harpsichord Concerto in E Flat* (Musicraft album No. 38, \$3.50) is nicely done by Ralph Kirkpatrick and a small string ensemble. (Recordings from the newer companies, like Musicraft and Timely, may be obtained from many large stores. In case of difficulty, communicate with this column.) Papa Bach is on the lists too, of course. Victor's set of *Suites No. 2 and No. 3 for Unaccompanied Cello* is superb, as played by Pablo Casals (album M-611, \$12). Only a master composer, through a master interpreter, could set forth such works, with their single melodic line, so as to suggest an inevitable basic harmonic structure.

The best church music of the month is a single Columbia disc (69752-D) of a choral cantata by Dietrich Buxtehude, long-neglected seventeenth-century precursor of

Bach. Called *Send Hid Den Engel*, it is beautifully sung by the Copenhagen Men and Boys Choir, with organ and string quintet accompaniment (not fully identified on the label). Victor publishes a new recording of the great Palestrina motet, *O Bone Jesu*, stirringly sung by the University of Pennsylvania Choral Society (15731); on the reverse side, an eighteenth-century motet, *Quaerite Primum*, by Claudio Casciolini, is less notable.

Ravel's delicate and imaginative *Ma Mère l'Oye* (Mother Goose) reappears on the lists in a transparently recorded performance by Howard Barlow and the Columbia Broadcasting Symphony (Columbia album X-151, \$3.50). The same conductor and this most excellent house orchestra uncork some *Rediscovered Music* of Johann Strauss (album M-389, \$5); polkas, waltzes and a quadrille, not of the best vintage but sparkling enough. Columbia continues its newest Chopin series with the *Fourteen Waltzes*, rather nervously played by Edward Kilenyi (album M-390, \$7.50).

Victor has rushed to publication its first recording by Dorothy Maynor, the young Negro soprano discovered last summer by Serge Koussevitzky, and hailed at her New York début this winter. Endowed with a warm, true, thrilling voice, she sings Schubert's *Ave Maria* and *Gretchen am Spinnrade* with fine artistry (15752, \$2). Royale recordings of the month include a couple of "firsts"—a two-piano arrangement of the amusing waltz from William Walton's *Façaade* suite, played by Clifford Herzer and Jascha Zayde (1808); and a far from profound but pleasant enough *Serenade* for two violins by Christian Sinding, well played by Eddy Brown and Roman Totenberg (1809-10).

The stanchest lovers of swing seem to have lost interest in the current popular outpourings. Almost to a man, they proclaim that there is little new jazz talent, little for a purist to like nowadays. Columbia is currently attempting to do something about the matter by labeling some of its red-label records (50 cents) "Jazz Masterworks." One of these is Benny Goodman's version of Mendelssohn's *Spring Song* (35319), arranged for *Swingin' the Dream*—a Broadway show which, if it did nothing else, opened the eyes of skeptics who could not understand why the nation's young jitterbugs made Goodman the Pied Piper of Swing. Another current "Masterwork" is good for nostalgia: Jack Teagarden's *Wolverine Blues* and *Muddy River Blues* (35297), and a new shot at the good old *Beale Street Blues* (35323).

A good combination of sentimental balladry and hot orchestration is *Ciribiribin* by Harry James and his orchestra; on the other side, a new breath of life in *Avalon* (Columbia 35316). In Royale's swing offering of another oldtimer, *The Sheik*, the Quintette of the Hot Club of France furnishes some superb guitar playing (1807). And, likewise from across the ocean, the Sextet of the Rhythm Club of London sets forth *Mighty Like the Blues* and *Calling All Bars* in an agreeable old-style fashion (Bluebird 10529).

Recommended briefly: Lee Wiley singing eight Gershwin songs (Liberty Music Shop, L-281-4). Mr. Gershwin liked her style, and a group of Gershwin admirers selected her for this assignment. . . . Muggsy Spanier's *At the Jazz Band Ball* and *Livery Stable Blues* (Bluebird 10508). . . . Matty Melneck's *William Tell Overture* and *Carnival of Venice* (Columbia 35299). . . . Tommy Dorsey's *Easy Does It* and *Am I Proud* (Victor 26429).

C. J. BALLIETT, JR.

Books of the Week

Strange Criticism

Forces in American Criticism. Bernard Smith. Harcourt. \$3.00

THE NEED of a good historical survey of American criticism is so real and the general plan of the present volume so promising that disappointment in its final summaries is likely to be proportionate. For to one who rightly wishes to "relate the history of American literature to the history of American life," it is both enlightening and exciting to track the story of our early provincial criticism, with its mingling of puritan and classic prejudices—the effort at "democratising culture" through the lyceum idea—the "genteel tradition"—the romantic criticism of the transcendentalists—the democracy and realism of Whitman and the West—down to the twentieth century war of traditions, which in Mr. Smith's highly debatable reasoning finds its only possible peace in contemporary Marxist criticism.

The author has an alert and at times brilliant mind with obvious blind spots. One of these he unconsciously confesses in his preface when admitting that he is "antagonistic to mysticism": hence he sees in Orestes Bronson's conversion to Catholicism merely an "escape"—and omits all mention of the subtle and balanced critical work contributed by Louise Guiney or Agnes Repplier. There are other and probably related prejudices, some of which may be summed up as follows: he has small use for Hawthorne, and dismisses Lowell—whose cosmopolitan outlook was recently praised by Mary Colum—as the "beau ideal of gentlemanly critics"; he is impatient with Henry Adams's sense of unified beauty as personified in medieval devotion to the Blessed Virgin; he scorns what he considers Stedman's "squeamishness," and finds Henry James's assertion that sexual passion is less interesting in itself than in "what it represents" through the rest of life and the personality of its partakers, an evidence of "intellectual snobbishness." In other words, he is all for the plain man and the plain phrase. But having the qualities of his defects, he sees—and consequently dislikes—T. S. Eliot, with his "leaning toward the Catholic churches," as the logical successor to the neo-humanism of More and Babbitt.

Already many of the militant young critics admired by Bernard Smith have faded as intellectual forces, and one wonders whether his own confident bias toward the left has been at all shaken by world events of the past three months. He is at least right in declaring that the three possible alternatives open to modern writers and modern men are the "confusion" and "multiplicity" of Joseph Wood Krutch, submission to the "eternal dragnet of religion" as exemplified in Mortimer Adler, or the Marxist philosophy to which he himself still hopefully subscribes.

KATHERINE BRÉGY.

BIOGRAPHY

J. Pierpont Morgan: An Intimate Portrait. Herbert L. Satterlee. Macmillan. \$3.75.

SINCE the late J. Pierpont Morgan was admittedly one of the great bankers of history, his life has tempted biographers. Many years ago, Carl Hovel wrote an enthusiastic account of his exploits. Recently, Lewis Corey and John K. Winkler have critically narrated his achieve-

ments. Now, twenty-five years after the death of the financier, his son-in-law Herbert L. Satterlee has published the only authorized record of his career.

Unfortunately, the official historian is imaginative in dealing with the great man's rivals. Mr. Satterlee dismisses the brilliance of the late E. H. Harriman, who resurrected the Union Pacific Railroad, by insisting that "... he trusted very few friends, and until his last years developed little talent for organizing." And while he mentions obscure episodes of the history of the banking house, such as the struggle with James Speyer & Company for the financing of the London Underground, he does not really evaluate the undertakings of the firm. Evidently, he is unable to distinguish between an error in judgment, like the New Haven, and a substantial accomplishment. Fatuously, the author concedes in the foreword that "... this story was not written with the idea of selling it to a publisher." Since his style is often tedious, his boast is supercilious.

Nevertheless, Mr. Satterlee does present a truly intimate, and at times fascinating, portrait of his father-in-law. He dwells on his portly taste in yachts, cigars, fine food and paintings. Apparently, whenever Morgan attended a Diocesan Convention of the Episcopal Church, he would "send Sherry ahead." The gifted caterer would then rent a mansion and prepare superb dinners for the clergymen his client entertained. Doubtless, as the banker's biographer claims, "it was part of his nature always to want the best."

WAYNE ANDREWS.

CRITICISM

The Renaissance and English Humanism. Douglas Bush. University of Toronto. \$1.50.

THIS IS a slender book composed of four lectures. In the first the author discusses modern theories of the Renaissance, its causes and nature; in the second and third he examines the character of classical humanism on the continent and in England and in the fourth and last, he seeks to find the place of Milton in the humanistic tradition.

This book is a worthy pendant to G. Wilson Knight's "The Burning Oracle." Both books must be read by those who are interested in furthering the Catholic literary revival. They are wise and profound books and are written in an urbane, simple, gracious and detached spirit. The vision which they present of the aristocratic, classical and humanistic traditions of Christianity cannot fail to captivate and enthrall their readers.

J. C.

Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights. Henry W. Wells. Columbia. \$2.75.

THIS BOOK proposes to supply a rounded, critical treatment of those English playwrights whose work was done between the terminal dates of the writing careers of Christopher Marlowe and James Shirley. It is matter for regret that a full review in the grand style is forbidden by exigencies of space, for this is no mere author-by-author analysis. It is a highly successful attempt to classify the so-called Elizabethan plays in philosophical categories in accordance with what Mr. Wells considers their dominating characteristics. All emphasis is put upon the plays themselves, all illustrations are drawn from them. There is no rhapsodical "appreciation," no Swinburnian gush; only a clear, competent statement and analysis. The book is solid with information and dotted with clever and striking phrases, for instance,

the dramatic romances of Beaumont and Fletcher "resemble dinner music played at a fashionable restaurant," and again, the distinction drawn between modern realism and Elizabethan artificiality on page 35.

In his introduction and conclusion, Mr. Wells permits himself the luxury of generalization, and these two chapters will serve any teacher as admirable syntheses of the drama of the period, its tendencies and conventions. Mr. Wells stresses especially the debt of the Elizabethans to medieval life, moral ideas and popular literature.

There is one minor error noticeable in the bibliography. On page 284, Mr. Wells refers to "Lady Cary, afterwards Lady Falkland." Cary was the family name of the Viscounts Falkland. Lady Elizabeth's maiden name was Tanfield.

J. G. E. HOPKINS.

POETRY

Clothed with the Sun. Fray Angelico Chavez. Writers' Editions. \$1.50.

FRAY ANGELICO CHAVEZ is a young Franciscan of the parish of Peña Blanca in New Mexico. It is well to mention this, because in his volume of verse the Franciscan spirit of joy and humility and the place of his mission with its "velvet voweled" words of Spain give definite color and tone to the book. One is arrested by its strange beauty as much as one is pleased by the music and originality of the verse.

The lyrics are, for the most part, deftly written, and they have power in their simplicity. Without innovations of form or strange vocabulary, they are rich in incidents and images. I liked especially the words the poet put into the mouth of Saint Francis who, when he sought to imitate the poverty of Christ, was forced at last to cry out: "Behold, the treasures that He pressed Into my hands are little holes." I wish it were possible to quote in full "Southwestern Night" which is one of the truly excellent poems in the book. These are the first and last stanzas:

The night had pitched her tar-dark tent
Which leaked with starlight everywhere,
When by the road on which I went
I came upon the firelit shapes
Of shepherds, lean and bent.

Up to the ceiling's taut, dark crown
They flowed as one, the strand of smoke.
Their thread of thought; and as my own
Turned heavenward to follow them,
The dew of stars dripped down.

There is an unevenness in the book; several of the lyrics (such as "Sunlight") would indicate a much earlier writing. However, judging the volume as a whole, I believe Fray Angelico Chavez may well be called one of the great hopes of Catholic poetry.

JESSICA POWERS.

RELIGION

The Dark Wheel. S. M. C. Kenedy. \$2.00.

THE AUTHOR of "Brother Petroc's Return" uses Cornwall again as her background. The story floats through time. Thanks to the prayers of his old nurse, a London barrister, who has come down to rest in her Cornish cottage, finds the barriers broken between himself and eternity. He is permitted to drift backwards on that living stream of consciousness which is continuous in the mind of God. Greville thus visits in pre-Reformation days the Augustinian Canons down the hill; spends

the night in the guest house of a Benedictine Nunnery and becomes accustomed to the rigors of the Dominican rule. From the hospitality of the Arundells of Lanherne he rides out to witness the martyrdom of Father Cuthbert Mayne in Launceston. There Greville's conversion is completed; he wakes to call for a priest, but it is the old nurse, Nellie, who baptizes him herself.

Never to look beyond the present day or hour but to hold fast to God and stand apart watching life as it were a pageant "for Grace was never for the future" is the lesson Greville learns from the hermit who had prayed for generations of Grevilles to come. Though it has the charm of S. M. C.'s good, simple English, those who love to reread "Brother Petroc" are sure to encounter disappointment in "The Dark Wheel." The narrative is shredded; time spins backwards and forwards; and the general theme is didactic. It seems something written to order for a publisher or the revision of an early manuscript. S. M. C. must be more chary of her gifts and of her inspiration.

EUPHEMIA VAN RENSSLAER WYATT.

The Flowering of Mysticism. Rufus M. Jones. Macmillan. \$2.50.

THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY saw the burgeoning of mysticism, from Basel to the Zuider Zee, all along the course of the Catholic Rhineland. Great towns and persons stand out—places where certain individuals lived, in sure realization of direct contact with God. These God-touched souls bore witness to an immediate, intuitive, experimental knowledge of God; they became known as the Friends of God. They drew directly from Catholic roots the sap of their piety and took for granted the Catholic framework of belief and practice. Frequently, however, their fervent experience of God made them impatient of the covenanted ways of grace and fearful of system and regimentation; there is no doubt that they were often better Catholics than many of their contemporaries. They lived in full view of an objective metaphysical world, which to them became more real than the Sacraments of their Church. Although Catholics, they were the unconscious forerunners of the Reformation, in that they were primarily individuals, going off on a tangent to the concept of social Catholicism.

Already the cleavage between sacramental mysticism and individual piety had begun, and later centuries were to see the gap widen, until "mysticism" should acquire a taint of the pathological and the heretical.

The phenomenon of mysticism is common to humanity; it has therefore a long history, reaching back through Catholic and Protestant mystics, through the Middle Ages, the Victorines, Saint Augustine, Plotinus and Plato to the ancient religions of the Orient. Dr. Jones has given an illuminating and scholarly account of the Fourteenth Century Friends of God in the Rhine Valley, from Hildegard and the Gertrudes, Eckhart, Fauler, Suso to Merswin, Ruysbroeck and Grotte. As a Quaker he appears not only to understand them but to feel at home with them. These great exponents of mystical experience, at a time when liturgical life, with its emphasis on the social "Body of Christ," was at a low level, are interesting souls—wandering stars from the full orbit of vital sacramental Christianity—but that they interest us does not mean that they convince or help us in these days of bankrupt individualism in religion. The real integral concrete Body of the Faithful offering the Mass in their parish church as the means of union with God and with each

other, and as the highest form of prayer and mystical experience, is far more effective of social sanctity, and therefore of personal sanctity, than the scattered efforts of individual mystics. Only the Liturgy provides that correct and basic relation to God and to all creation—the classic relationship of creatures to God through Jesus Christ—which makes for the true mysticism, which is at once social and individual. RICHARD FLOWER, O.S.B.

The Church and the Social Problem of Our Day. Karl Barth. Scribners. \$1.00.

IT IS always a stirring experience to read Karl Barth. For any one who wants to get acquainted with the mind of this great leader of our separated brethren, this book is excellent. It has all the brisk, sincere and earnest zeal of the great Swiss Christian who led his fellow-Protestant friends out of the jungle of relativism, scepticism and unholy worldliness into the presence of the "Living God." This is all definitely Protestant and therefore unacceptable to us in its presuppositions and even its conclusions. But it contains gems of a living, original "actualisation" of faith which puts many of us to shame.

Barth's use of the words "danger," "promise," "decision," "actualisation," the "here and now," "repetition in human weakness what Christ in divine power was, *vs.* recitation of formulas" cuts to the quick and leaves the reader salubriously wounded. "Woe to the Church if, when the hour and occasion comes, she is silent, or merely meditates and discusses or just falls back into a bare recitation." Out of this sorrow, in a Church which has no official spokesman, he decides that he has to warn his people and all Christians against an easy and cowardly compromise with the secularism of Nazidom. With Rauschning's work this little book stands as a vigorous, brave challenge to that utter corruption of society and ethics called Nazidom. Both are worthy allies to Pius XI's magnificent encyclical, "With burning sorrow."

H. A. REINHOLD.

The Spirit of Gregorian Chant. Marie Pierik. McLaughlin and Reilly. \$2.75.

ALTHOUGH the authoress of this exhaustive compilation of the accepted authorities (with their sayings), makes no pretensions for its acceptance as a textbook, it might well be used as a basis for a series of masterly addresses, or lectures, on the much-discussed and little-understood topic of liturgical esthetics. The admirable introduction, admirably supported by such historical figures as Pius X, Dom Pothier, Dr. Peter Wagner and Vincent d'Indy, spreads a "menu" for the reader, which is developed in the subsequent chapters.

It seems to me that Chapter 6 ("Melody and the Mass") should prove the most useful to those who are essaying the revival of a stricter interpretation of the ritual music of Holy Mother Church, while the last chapter contains much useful information and advice that many organists and choirmasters sadly need. To be a good organist does not always imply a sufficient knowledge of the very practical duties of a choirmaster. No one can teach until he has taught, and Miss Pierik has rendered good service in the choice of the title of this volume, for it has been truly said in Holy Writ that "the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." May she gain many converts to the chant and thus spread the good news of its utilitarian beauties.

B. G.

B. ALTMAN & CO.

**our greatest single purchase
and sale of fine**

Oriental rugs

**at prices which bear no
relation to their real value**

196.00

values 350.00 to 750.00

296.00

values 575.00 to 1100.00

**don't miss this vast, varied col-
lection ... rugs which originally
sold for thousands now for a
few hundreds. Many types no
longer loomed today. Rare val-
ues in the very large sizes. Sizes
to fit any room ... prices to fit
every budget. fifth floor**

Fifth Avenue New York



needs

A GALLON OF GAS

The Flying Priest

to fly medical aid and to save souls! Your help will be appreciated, and a copy of "Wings for the Tabernacle" will be sent to you without charge.

Reverend Paul Schulte
The Flying Priest

P. O. Box 4437 Washington, D. C.

MADONNA HOUSE BENEFIT SHOP

Proceeds for the poor of the Lower East Side.
Queensboro Bridge Market

59th St. & First Ave.

ELdorado 5-4794

WE NEED:

Clothing Furniture House Furnishings

We will call for anything you will give. Contributions of money will greatly help our work here among God's poor.

MADONNA HOUSE

169-175 Cherry Street New York City

St. Hilda Guild, Inc.



Church Vestments, Altar Linen
Ecclesiastical Embroidery

Conferences with reference to the
adornment of churches

Old Embroidery Transferred
147 EAST 47th ST. NEW YORK
ELdorado 5-1058

BETHANY HOUSE

(Conducted for Women by the Maryknoll Sisters)
DELIGHTFULLY SITUATED AMONG THE WESTCHESTER HILLS
Spacious Grounds—Modern Structure—Excellent Table and Service
Comfort and Refinement—Chapel—Daily Mass

REASONABLE RATES

Sr. Director, BETHANY HOUSE, Ossining, Maryknoll P. O., N. Y.
Tel. No. Ossining 1452

Classified Advertising

RATES for classified advertising: One to twelve times, 40c per type line. Thirteen consecutive insertions, 36c per line. Twenty-six or more consecutive insertions, 32c per line. Minimum space, three lines.

**Reliable Research
WOULD YOU LIKE HELP**

**With Your
THESIS, ARTICLE, STORY, BOOK?
Expert Editing
Box 27, The Commonwealth**

The Inner Forum

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION has had some of its most devastating effects in the densely populated Kingdom of Belgium, where for the first 50 years of industrial development workers were almost without any protection. Torn from the rural parishes of their forebears and thrown into strange industrial centers they were unable to cope with unfamiliar conditions. Employers freely cut wages and lengthened hours; many factories kept right on working when Sunday came. Neglected at home and deprived of religious instruction in school, thousands of children followed their harassed parents and lost even the consolations of the Faith.

This was the background for the development of the now flourishing Christian trade union movement, according to Joseph Arendt, S.J., in the current *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*. "The immediate aim of union action is to study, promote and defend the professional interests of the workers, chiefly in their negotiations with employers, employer groups and the public authorities. . . . In order to fulfil its mission well the union must be guided by principles. It must bring about the primacy of justice and charity and thus foster social peace. It must be permeated with the necessity of a truly healthy family life. . . ."

When seeking to enroll new members the Christian trade union naturally sets forth its underlying principles. Delegates and other union leaders exercise considerable personal influence in their workaday contacts. Other ordinary means of carrying on the work of education are the meetings sponsored by the unions and their posters, articles, pamphlets and periodicals.

The all-important task of training leaders is undertaken in parish study groups and regional labor schools. The Christian *Centrale* of metallurgists started the practice of labor union weekends which include religious and social instruction, together with Sunday Mass and Communion in common. It is estimated that out of 400,000 union members 10,000 are regional or local directors or delegates of the movement. One of the most interesting achievements of the Confederation of Christian Trade Unions is the publication of a "Catechism of the Militant Trade Unionist" (*Catéchisme du militant syndical*).

CONTRIBUTORS

Right Rev. L. G. LIGUTTI is pastor at Grainger, Iowa, who has won himself distinction as a worker in the field of rural sociology and who spent last summer in Europe investigating agricultural problems.

Leonard A. ALLEN is an ex-WPA worker with twenty-five months' experience.

M. Whitcomb HESS is connected with the Ohio University.

Vincent J. McLAUGHLIN is on the faculties at New Rochelle and Manhattan Colleges and a lecturer at the School of Education at Fordham University.

C. J. BALLIETT, Jr., continues his monthly column on records; he is an associate editor of *Time*.

Katherine BREGY is a poet, lecturer and essayist, author of many books and resident of Philadelphia.

Wayne ANDREWS is the author of "The Vanderbilt Legend," currently appearing in *Town and Country*.

J. G. E. HOPKINS writes poems and short stories and teaches at the College of Notre Dame, Staten Island, N. Y.

Jessica POWERS is a Wisconsin poet currently living near New York city; her first volume of verse, "The Lantern Burns," was published last fall.

Euphemia van Rensselaer WYATT is dramatic critic of the *Catholic World*.

Rev. Richard FLOWER, O.S.B., is sub-prior of St. Gregory's Priory, Portsmouth, R. I.

Rev. H. A. REINHOLD is stationed in Seattle, Wash.